



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,278	01/30/2001	Gregory M. Lanza	4375-000004/US	2535
25225	7590	02/08/2005	EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 3811 VALLEY CENTRE DRIVE SUITE 500 SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2332			SHARAREH, SHAHNAM J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/774,278

Applicant(s)

LANZA ET AL.

Examiner

Shahnam Sharareh

Art Unit

1617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3, 7, 8, 13, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 31, 35 and 68-77.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
13. ☐ Other: _____.


SREENI PADMANABHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the amendment has added a new limitation of requiring the nanoparticle to be in liquid state during all steps of (a)-(c) which modifies the scope of the claims and requires further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record. Applicant's amendment has modified the scope of the claims and requires further consideration. However, Examiner would address one central issue to respond to the central theme of Applicant's arguments. Applicant argues that Ostenson does not teach nanoparticles and thus is not able to anticipate or render the instant claims obvious. As articulated during the prosecution the scope of the limitation "nanoparticle" is determined in view of the specification. At page 21, lines 7-10 Applicant sets forth that the size of his particles can be as large as 10 microns. Further, the state of art repeatedly defines the terms such as "nanoparticles" or "nanospheres" etc. to encompass larger particles than merely 1000 nm. In fact, the prior art nanoemulsions described in US Patent 5,690,907 and relied on the page 2 of the instant specification prepares such particles as large as 5000 nm which is about 5 microns. Therefore, the state of art and the instant specification draws an illusory difference between the particles described in Ostenson and the instant nanoparticles. Based on such interpretation, Examiner has viewed the particle sizes described in Ostenson to fall within the scope of the instant nanoparticles. Moreover, the instant claims are not directed to any particular sized particles. They are merely directed to the use of particles generically described as "nanoparticles." Furthermore, as described on record, absent a showing of unexpected results, differences in particle size are not viewed to render the instant claims patentable over the prior art. Thus, the rejections of record are maintained.